Amdt Date: 05/19/05

RESPONSE TO "NON-FINAL" OFFICE ACTION of 11/22/2004 Examiner Theresa T. Snider Group Art Unit: 1744 Confirmation No. 5765

Remarks

The numbered paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 12-14 "under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite." Specifically, the Examiner inquired as to whether in claim 1, line 16 'pad' should be inserted after 'scrubber'? The applicant has requested that claim 1, element E have 'pad' inserted after 'scrubber'. The applicant believes that this requested amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection. this paragraph and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The Examiner provided the reference to sections in Title 35, US Code provided in the prior Office action. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
- 4. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatcher et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Warren et al., Thomas, Sr. et al. and Wulff. The applicant has requested that claim 1, on which claims 2-8 and 12-14 depend be amended to point out that applicant's invention includes a buffer pad cover and triple blade squeegee. Although, the references cited by the Examiner disclose buffers and scrubbers, the applicant believes that the particular configuration of the

Examiner Theresa T. Snider Group Art Unit: 1744 Confirmation No. 5765

App. S/N: 09/865,766 Amdt Date: 05/19/05

buffers, scrubbers and squeegee of this invention is new, non-obvious and provides exceptional advantages over machines having a single buffer/polisher, having a cleaning brush, or having multiple buffer pads. The applicant believes applicant's invention provides the simultaneous scrubbing and buffing, with improved buffing and improved waste water collection that is not found, described or suggested by the cited or any other known references, either alone or in combination. Since claims 2-8 and 12-14 depend on claim 1, they include the limitations of claim 1. Therefore the applicant believes that this requested amendment, in combination with the other elements/limitations of the claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Amendment

4. The Examiner indicated that "with respect to the new claim language inserted into claim 1 in the 10/21/2004 amendment, it is believed not to be new matter because it is fully supported by the drawings. However, Applicant should also insert the language into the appropriate location in the specification." The applicant has requested that the appropriate language be inserted into the specification.

Response to Arguments

5. The Examiner indicated that the "applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 12-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and believes that, in light of the applicant's new requested amendments to the claims, no specific response is required for this paragraph.

Amdt Date: 05/19/05

RESPONSE TO "NON-FINAL" OFFICE ACTION of 11/22/2004

Examiner Theresa T. Snider Group Art Unit: 1744 Confirmation No. 5765

Conclusion

6. The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assistance regarding this case and believes no response to this paragraph is necessary.

The applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended as previously described.

The applicant therefore believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. Applicant believes that the pending claims 1-8 and 12-14 including the amended claim 1, are patentable over all known prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 19th day of May, 2005.

Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154

SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.

15 West South Temple, Suite 1200

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 Telephone: (801) 257-1900 Facsimile: (801) 257-1800